UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

With Clean Hands and a Neutral Heart, America! - - *Brent Dow Allinson*

An Interview with Five American Immortals - - - - - - *Louis I. Newman*

A Naturalistic View of Religion - - - - - - - - *Gardner Williams*

The Scientific Spirit and the Modern World - - - - - - *George R. Farnum*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXV NUMBER 5

Chicago, May 6, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 67
Jottings—J. H. H. 69
Opposed!—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 70

ARTICLES—

With Clean Hands and a Neutral Heart, America!—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 70
An Interview with Five American Immortals—LOUIS I. NEWMAN 73
A Naturalistic View of Religion—GARDNER WILLIAMS 74
The Scientific Spirit and the Modern World: An Indictment and a Homily—GEORGE R. FARNUM 76
On the Pacifist Front—XIII 77

POETRY—

Far from the World—ANNERIKA FRIES 72
To Our Mothers—JEROME ALEXANDER 79

THE STUDY TABLE—

A Practical Philosophy—CURTIS W. REESE 79
Hebraism and Hellenism—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 79

CORRESPONDENCE—

Mrs. Roosevelt and the Ministers—OLIVE COLE SMITH 80
The Southern Traveling Seminar—WILLARD UPHAUS 80

THE FIELD—

Lynching Goes Underground 66
Western Poets Congress 80

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Lynching Goes Underground

With regard to the whole problem of lynching, your investigator desires to make the following statement. It is his considered judgment that, for various reasons, lynching is entering a new and altogether dangerous phase. Lynchings in the past have been characterized by the mob, the faggot, the rope. Hundreds of people, often thousands, poured out to participate or witness the lynching of a man or woman accused of some crime, often of the most trivial nature and often without any real charge at all. Pictures of the mobbed and mobbers have been taken and widely circulated. Souvenirs of the lynched man or woman, in the form of fingers, toes and other parts of the body, have been brazenly displayed by members of the mob.

Public opinion is beginning to turn against this sort of mob activity. Sentiment is growing against lynching. Agitation for Federal and state anti-lynching laws gives pause to the lynching crowd. Lynching, they say, must go on, but it must be done quietly so as not to attract attention, draw publicity. Thus those who must rule by terror and intimidation turn to new methods. The old mob is disappearing but the work of the mob goes on. A Negro is accused of some crime, real or alleged. A few white men gather, formulate their plans, seize their victim. In some lonely swamp a small body of men do the job formerly done by a vast, howling, bloodthirsty mob composed of men, women and children. The word is then passed that the matter has been handled to the satisfaction of those in charge of such matters.

Your investigator has probed numerous lynchings. His acquaintance with lynchers and the lynched extends over a lifetime. It is his judgment that countless Negroes are lynched yearly, but their disappearance is shrouded in mystery, for they are dispatched quietly and without general knowledge. The lynching of Joe Rodgers is a case in point.

It is his judgment that a careful study covering four or five states of the deep South for a period of months would reveal a startling number of lynchings otherwise unaccounted for. He believes that a revelation of this character would greatly influence public opinion and go a long way in rectifying the present situation.

Your investigator was informed by competent observers that since the notorious double blowtorch lynching which occurred at Duck Hill, Mississippi, in 1937, word has been passed that in the future all difficulties between Negroes and whites will be handled by a small group of white men already appointed for that purpose. He was similarly advised that in the vicinity of Cleveland, Mississippi, at least four Negroes had been lynched within the past four or five months. It is his judgment finally that every effort should be made to se-

(Continued on page 80)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXV MONDAY, MAY 6, 1940 No. 5

COSMOS OUT OF CHAOS

Man has, in the last issue, only one weapon for dealing with the innumerable problems which bewilder and which may destroy him, the weapon of thought. Thought may go wrong; but it is the best guide we have, if it is patient, if it is based on study, if it is unwarped by personal interests, and moved by the spirit of good will. Need we ask no more? Yes, just a little more. We may ask something of that spirit which, since the very beginnings of history, men have expected and found in the average common soldier—a will to endure hardship for the sake of duty and to use life as one who knows of things better than life. . . . I look to intellectual coöperation among men of good will for the restoring of our lost Cosmos and the ultimate wise guidance of the world.

—*Gilbert Murray*

THE BREAK HAS COME

The war is now under full headway. What we have been awaiting and dreading all these months is at last full upon us. The battle between Britain and Germany is joined, and not on any front hitherto anticipated—not on the western front, nor in the Balkans, nor yet in the Near East. The supreme tragedy is that Scandinavia, innocent of all offense, is to be the area of conflict, at least for the present. That Germany has taken the offensive in this matter is not surprising, but that she has taken the offensive in this way and at this place is most decidedly surprising. Indeed, it strikes us that the Reich has now made the mistake that Britain has been waiting for all these months—given the opening that sooner or later follows upon a prolonged sparring match. The comparison with Belgium is unescapable. By which we mean that, as the invasion of Belgium in 1914 was the first act of that drama of doom for Germany which ended more than four years later in the Armistice, so the invasion of Denmark and Norway marks the opening of a similar drama which must sooner or later end in doom for Hitler. Meanwhile, as we hang breathless upon the iron order of events, there remains the horror of the spectacle of these unoffending, delightful, highly civilized little nations being devoured in cold blood by the monster of war. Germany, be it remembered, had a mutual non-aggression pact with Denmark, signed only last year, as Russia had a similar pact with Finland. The guilt of these two piratical nations is beyond parallel, except with one another. But the real culprit, nonetheless, is the war monster itself. This is just why war is so criminal a thing. Once released into the world, and it destroys everything under circumstances of unimaginable wickedness. Finland seemed cruel enough, but now come Denmark and Norway as equally innocent victims stretched upon the bleeding altar of Mars. Germany, it must be, is jealous of Russia! Outbid by the Soviets in their hideous and inexcusable invasion of Finland, the Reich has now "seen" Russia and raised her bid for the stakes of utter barbarism in the modern world. What Russia will do next, to outbid Germany in turn, is anybody's guess. Meanwhile, both gamesters have discovered that the Allies are to be reckoned with. And so war spreads, like a pestilence, and slowly the world is engulfed. There is no end to this thing but to *stop war* as we would stamp out a pestilence.

A HIGHER ALLEGIANCE!

Not the least startling aspect of the Norwegian *coup* is the fact that Norway was not so much conquered by her enemies as betrayed and surrendered by her own traitorous citizens. For days it remained a mystery how the invaders ever succeeded so miraculously in taking over their objectives with such speed and precision. Then came the explanation—that Norway was honeycombed not with alien but with native Nazis, who were working in conspiracy with Berlin and at the appointed moment opened the dikes to the Swastika flood. There were Norwegians, in other words, as there are probably Dutch, and Belgians, and English, and French, and Americans, who recognize an allegiance primary to their allegiance to their own country, which thereupon becomes secondary. And this applies not only to Nazis but also to Communists! Indeed, there are probably more Communists in these various countries who would serve Russia in betrayal of their own lands than there are Nazis and Fascists. We have come to a time, in other words, when a higher allegiance is being recognized than that to one's own national government. In place of one's native land there appears now a universal cause, an internationalism, which exacts and receives the first devotion of the heart. Which seems, in the light of Naziism and Communism, to be a strange and ghastly perversion of that very international spirit which we have long been insisting is the sole salvation of mankind. A United States of the World—that has become our ideal! And here the Nazis think they have found it in the Reich and the Communists in Russia—and they would bring it in by force and violence,

tyranny, terror, and treason. Is it possible that in this spectacle of grim and ghastly betrayal of the standards of a whole civilization, there is one more illustration of good coming out of evil—the principle proclaimed by the ancient prophet, of God making the wrath of men to praise him? Who knows—perhaps nationalism is beginning to break up in these horrid forms of chaos, and in due time there will appear a true and blessed internationalism to take the place of this universal terror which now threatens to engulf us!

ARMIES AND NAVIES—AND ANOTHER WAR!

The plea that the enormous expenditures for armaments on land and sea and in the air are for the defense of this nation against foreign attacks is too ridiculous for words. When this European war is done, there won't be a nation in the world able to launch an attack upon anybody for a generation. And even if invasion of our shores from abroad were possible, we have long since made ample provision to defend ourselves. Granted our geographical advantages east and west, and a navy second to none is as absurd as an army of the same ratio. No, there can be but one reason for this enormous building program now being financed by Congress to the tune of billions of dollars, and the military men know it well, while saying nothing about it. These arms are wanted not for defense but for attack—for a fight against Japan in Asia, and against Germany and Russia in Europe! Already we are looking at Japan with a chip on our shoulder, and daring her to knock it off. Let Japan so much as fire a gun or move a ship against Allied interests in Asia, and our navy and our army—boys conscripted from our homes and schools and workshops—would be speeding across the Pacific at top speed. As for Europe, we have made perfectly plain our tie-up with British interests, and let Britain go on losing the war as steadily and surely in the next six months as she has been losing it in the last six months, and our sailors and soldiers will be speeding east across the Atlantic. That's the reason for all this clamor for increased armaments—for these incalculable appropriations for machines and guns and ammunition. Our political and military authorities see us getting into the war in Asia, or in Europe, or in both places—are all for having us in the war—and are plotting and planning for the day. And when it comes, the people who provide the money and the blood will have as little to say about it as they had in 1917. The zero hour is of course uncertain—it depends a good deal on what Japan does, and what Germany and Russia and Italy do. Other things being equal, however, it is probable that the crisis will be postponed until after election. We will have a peace campaign—"keep out of the war"! And then—an April 1941 to match an April 1917. All this preparedness, in other words, has a reason. It's not to prevent but to prepare the next war.

JEWS IN GERMANY

A European correspondent of the *American Hebrew* gives some vital statistics pertaining to the Jews in Germany. During the six months from September, 1939, to February, 1940, (inclusive), only five Jewish children were born in all the Reich. Less than one child a month for a whole people! During this same period, the death rate among Jews rose to an unprecedented figure. Thus, in Berlin alone, there died 1844 Jewish persons, of whom 1112 were men and 732 were women. Here in these figures do we see depicted "the tragedy that has befallen a once great and wealthy community, a community which has now been reduced not merely to poverty and degradation, but is actually being physically exterminated." The Jews have suffered many things in their dreadful history, but never anything quite like this. Indeed, we question whether history anywhere has anything to match it. There have been whole populations put to the sword on many a bloody occasion—the Jews themselves have tasted massacre as well as persecution and outlawry! But here is a population numbering hundreds of thousands of the most prosperous, cultivated, and excellent people in the world, put to death by slow process of starvation and general misery! These German Jews are not so much being killed as denied the means wherewith to live, as well as subjected to every insult and humiliation known to sadist cruelty. This is to us a kind of supreme horror—not so dramatic, and sensational, and "messy" as out-and-out slaughter, but in the process and in the end alike a more ghastly torture and an equally sure extinction. We remember saying, on our return from a visit in Germany in 1935, that there would not be a Jew alive in that unhappy country in another twenty-five years. We were wrong in this prophecy only in the number of years named. Here only five years have gone—and death is working so fast among German Jews that in another five years it will probably be all over. Hitler and the Nazis have many crimes to atone for before the judgment bar of history. None of them all, we believe, will surpass in calculated cruelty and utter horror this extinction by slow pressure of a proud, sensitive, and noble people who were themselves loyal Germans as well as Jews. *Der Fuehrer* had some ghastly predecessors in this anti-Semitic business, but he has outdone them all.

NUMBERING THE PEOPLE

The census has been taken, and the nation has survived the ordeal. All the thundering and muttering in protest seems to have availed nothing in the way of stirring the people to rebellion, and the government now knows how much money we earn and whether or not we have an electric refrigerator. It's curious—but there seems always to have been some opposition to this census business. God began it, apparently, when he punished David for murdering Israel and Judah

(see II Samuel 24). We wonder that, in all his single-handed agitation, Senator Tobin never once called God to witness to the righteousness of his word. And not only God but Joab, we read, was disturbed by David's order to take a census. "Why doth my lord the king delight in this thing," said Joab. But the important thing is that the census was taken in Israel, just as it has now been taken in this country. As one looks back upon the process, one can only marvel that anybody got excited over this official quest for useful information. Take the matter of personal income, for example! Ministers' salaries are wide open to the public, and so are the salaries of school teachers, and selectmen, and aldermen, and policemen, and firemen, and mayors, and judges, and Congressmen, and presidents. Why should others, in private instead of public employment, want to make a secret of this matter? Or the question about the value of your home and the size of the mortgage! The valuation is duly listed in the appraiser's office, and is there open to the inspection of anybody who is interested. As for the mortgage, we have never known anybody who didn't boast of his mortgage and the burden of carrying it. The fact is this census furore was "phoney" from the beginning. On the part of public officials, it was an attempt to take an effective slap at the New Deal; on the part of private citizens, it was nothing but the indulgence of a grudge against the government in particular and the world in general. A census is not only necessary but beneficent. The more we can know about ourselves the better. It is a very important part of democracy to live in the open. Under a dictatorship there is good reason for living behind closed doors and curtained windows, and concealing facts. But in government of the people, by the people, and for the people, there must be a sharing of experience to match a sharing of responsibility. It is to the credit of the American citizenry that they refused to take this census agitation seriously, and, with their accustomed good nature, entered wholeheartedly into a great coöperative enterprise for the public good.

"CHARLIE" ANDREWS

C. F. Andrews, dead in India last month, was "Charlie" to all who knew and loved him—and to know him was to love him! This was no coarse flippancy of address, but signified rather an endearing intimacy of affection which removed straightway every formal barrier between heart and heart. If ever there was a consecrated soul, an utterly simple, guileless and saintly character, it was "Charlie" Andrews. An Englishman, a brilliant scholar at Cambridge, he put by every enticement of the world, and every entanglement as well (for he had neither wife, nor home, nor possessions of any kind), and gave himself as a Christian missionary to the salvation of the lost. His interpretation of "salvation" may have ended with the redeemed in heaven, but it certainly began and continued with all tasks of political and social emancipation right here upon the earth. His thought of "the lost" may have had some theological implications, but was in essence an acceptance of all the myriads of mankind who were in one way or another denied opportunity and privilege, even justice and mercy, in our so-called Christian world. As a missionary, he was active primarily in foreign parts—first in South Africa, where he met Gandhi and began that blessed friendship and partnership by which he is best known to the world. Later he went to India, and there became a central figure in the great movement for national independence. Along with this went tireless work along educational, religious, and reform lines for the uplift of the oppressed multitudes of India and other dependent areas of Empire. For years, Andrews was like a fire-chief—on duty to hear the alarm, and to spread posthaste to the point of danger. He was always traveling, now here, now there, to bring succor to those in any trouble. But mostly he was in India, with Gandhi, Tagore, Nehru, and the Indian Congress. Andrews was as humble, pure-hearted, self-forgetting as St. Francis—as brave, sacrificial, tireless as St. Xavier. Orthodox Christian as he was, there was still not an atom of the theological prejudice or ecclesiastical interest in all his life. He was the veritable reincarnation of the Christ spirit. Utterly absorbed in his work—poorly, often grotesquely dressed—radiant with the inner light of love—he was one who "having nothing, yet hath all"

Jottings

"Rev. Cornelius Greenway of Brooklyn, New York, was urged by his church to take a few days' rest after Easter, and went to Washington, where he assisted in the service of our National Church, March 31st."—The *Christian Leader.*

One more illustration of the "bus-man's holiday"!

"Plans for a non-aggression pact between Russia and Roumania are under discussion in Berlin, it was reported tonight in diplomatic circles."—Associated Press dispatch.

In view of what happened to Finland and Denmark, it would seem as though Roumania were preparing to commit suicide.

In the last war, we had a Wilson for President. In this war, we have a Wilsonian for President. Is the result in both cases going to be the same?

The Moscow *Izvestia* approves the German invasion of Denmark and Norway, and declares that Germany was "forced to take this action in self-defense." The way the mice are attacking the cats these days, not to speak of the lambs attacking the wolves, is certainly something terrible.

J. H. H.

Opposed!

I was opposed to the last war (1914-1918), and to America's participation therein. When this country entered the war in April, 1917, I announced to my people that I was unalterably opposed to the government's action and could give no support to the war, but would give all possible support to people stricken by the war, enemies and friends alike. I did what I could to live up to this resolve.

I am opposed to this war, a continuation of the last war as one more chapter in the imperialistic struggle between Britain and Germany for the mastery of the world. There is no new element in this war to justify any alteration of opinion or condonation of offense. This war is madness on both sides; both sides are guilty of force, violence, and hate; both are joining in a struggle which must wreck civilization, despoil culture, paganize religion, and bring back the dark ages. I will have nothing to do with it. Nor will I have anything to do with America's participation in this war, if the country for any reason, however plausible, decides to enter into the European struggle. For I shall know that in this war, as in the last war, any reason, however plausible, will prove in due course to be the calculated design of selfish and dishonest propaganda. There can be no good reason for entering into a war which is itself wicked. What I can do to help peoples everywhere I will do—the people of Germany as well as of America, the people of Russia as well as of France. But I will do nothing to aid a government, my own included, which betrays its helpless and innocent citizens to the horror, destruction, and death of war.

I am opposed to all war, without restriction or exception. I am thus opposed to all war because, yesterday the sport of kings, today the game of empire-makers and defenders, it is always the violation of God's will and purpose for humanity. "War," said William Ellery Channing, "is the concentration of all human crimes." As such it is always, everywhere, and absolutely inconsistent with religion. War may conceivably be justified on material grounds, but cannot under any circumstances be justified, or even extenuated, on spiritual grounds. No man can truly recognize and worship God, the Father of all mankind, and take part in or give support to war. Especially can no man accept and follow Jesus, who laid down the law of "love your enemies" and "resist not evil," and sanction war. Very especially can no man be a minister of God and Christ, the living witness of God's spirit and Christ's word, and do anything but oppose war to the uttermost. The attempt to reconcile war with religion must ever remain as impossible as it is incredible. It is the ultimate blasphemy.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

With Clean Hands and a Neutral Heart, America!

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

I.

An influential fraction of the American people, led by the English Speaking Union and, apparently, by the President, are still rejoicing over the repeal of the arms embargo provision of the Neutrality Act—called by Senator Pittman, the Peace Act of 1937—that was passed unanimously by the Senate after extended debate, and with but one dissenting vote by the House. Are they celebrating the prospect of manifold profits to the aviation industry and the most sinister branches of the steel business, the munitions manufacturers? Are they pleased at the tender of large economic and even unneutral assistance to the imperial "democratic" Allies with the increased probability of eventual world war in which Hitler's detested government and hated Reich will, it is hoped, be destroyed, and the German people reduced again to starvation, disintegration, penury, and international vassalage? Was it, in fine, commercial acquisitiveness and greed, fear, or moral idealism, hate, or self-righteous indignation at numerous Nazi atrocities that moved the special session of the 76th Congress to take its much-controverted action and, after nearly sixty days of continuous debate, to renounce and abandon the advanced ethical and legal position of impartial neutrality and honorable non-interventionism which the Congress itself, after prolonged study, had formulated as a permanent foreign policy for the United States? Nothing is more interesting than such an inquiry into the tangled complexity of the political process in a self-styled democracy.

It must be admitted that the repeal of the arms embargo by the Administration, like its rejection of repeated proposals for a constitutional amendment (proposed by Senator LaFollette, Representative Ludlow, and others) requiring an affirmative vote of the people at a national referendum before a declaration of war may be lawfully proclaimed, or American troops or naval vessels sent abroad to participate in foreign war, was a compromise of democratic principle with circumstantial expediency, a victory of fear over idealism and the lessons of historic experience. The repeal of the arms embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act was accomplished, not without an impressive parliamentary struggle and long debate, under strong pressure from the Executive and the operation of mixed motives and propagandas, aided unquestionably by furtive lobbies of the airplane and munitions manufacturers and their friends in the War and Navy Departments. What are its economic and political consequences?

Some of them are already apparent, and are sufficiently disappointing to those who advocated a modified return to *laissez-faire* policy in the matter of the international arms-traffic, either for supposedly patriotic reasons, or because of substantial commercial advantages and financial benefits to American business expected to result from large-scale war orders of the cash-and-carry

belligerents. Not only are ringing protests being heard in Congress against the profiteering "racket" of the airplane manufacturers, who are increasing their prices for planes manufactured for sale to the American Government on account of their competitive orders for rush deliveries of planes to the French and British,—thus burdening the American taxpayer in two ways; but more serious embarrassments than this are already appearing, to the consternation of more peaceable producers of the staples of normal commerce.

The injury to long-term American agricultural interests arising from what amounts to a governmental subsidy to the aviation industry and the munitions-makers is pictured vividly by the announcement that the British are abandoning their immense purchases of fresh fruits, tobacco, and cotton in the United States, and transferring their orders either to growers of these commodities in the Dominions or their war Allies, in France, Egypt, Turkey, and India, for political, if not "totalitarian," reasons. For years, British purchases of these great staples of our agriculture have amounted to well over 100 million dollars annually. Thus, it is not too much to say that this figure represents the immediate cost to American economy, and to the most hard-pressed sector of it, of the arms embargo repeal and the credit-restrictions imposed upon belligerents by the revised Neutrality Act. Worse still, now becoming evident is a general re-direction of Anglo-French economy towards planned imperial autarchy, with a view to assisting their own allies and penalizing neutrals as well as enemies, and with the further purpose of applying pressure, through exchange restrictions as well as the transfer of purchases, to the end of coercing the United States and other neutrals to withdraw their proper prohibitions of loans and credits against belligerents, and to abandon all pretense of neutrality in favor of outright participation in the war against Germany. Here is cause for genuine alarm. For if the cost of neutrality, as of other forms of morality, becomes too great, almost any nation will surrender, at last, to the dangerous blandishments of belligerency!

The official British policy was more or less openly expressed last December in an editorial in the London *Observer,* whose editor, Mr. J. L. Garvin, is regarded as an authoritative spokesman for the Conservative Party. This strange war, commented the journal, is going to bring great surprises to the Americans, among others.

> The cash-and-carry provisions of their Neutrality Act mean that the British Government must make inroads upon its resources of gold, dollars, and securities [to pay for its purchases in the United States]. It is an elementary principle of British policy not to do so, except as a last resort. The result is that those American firms which expected the release of huge orders from Britain find that, on the contrary, the orders on the one hand are likely to be restricted to munitions, and on the other hand will be given only when they cannot be satisfied elsewhere.

Thus, it was plain enough, even before the repealer passed both houses of Congress, that the British and French Governments, whom perhaps it may seem to be unkind to remind that they have not yet paid the immense debts contracted with our Government for the materials purchased on credit twenty-five years ago, are going to transfer a great proportion of their cash purchases elsewhere to further their war purposes; and, if or when things go badly for the Empires, we may expect to see a political drive in the United States further to weaken the American Neutrality Act, if not to abandon it entirely in favor of "international law" and an untrammelled presidential discretion of the kind wielded by Woodrow Wilson, in 1916. Is this situation not a refutation of the arguments advanced by the editors of *The New Republic* and other pro-Ally Americans who declared, during the political controversy concerning modification of the Neutrality Act, that the arms embargo feature of it was but a minor issue because, in the World War, American shipments of arms and munitions to the Allied Governments amounted to only about 15 per cent of the whole? It now appears that the percentage assumed by our sales of airplanes, army trucks, and the direct contraband of war to the British and French may soon amount to well over 60 per cent of their total cash purchases from the United States, during the period of its legal neutrality in the present appalling and abominable, but not unprecedented, war—whose underlying issues and outcome are by no means clear. It grows apparent that by the recent apostasy of Congress from its own well-formulated and self-imposed standard of neutral honor and duty in commercial relationships with belligerents, our lawmakers have succeeded in doing little more than to sacrifice the long-term interests of American farmers and agriculture to the short-term, acquisitive interests of the most deadly and destructive branches of the steel industry, to say nothing of the disservice done to the progress of international law and the hope of peace—or at least of neutrality—in the future, by reason of furthering the fallacious assumption that every war between the Great Powers, or any of them, must become a world war.

The mischief already done to American economy by action of the British and French Governments in transferring their purchases of tobacco, is estimated at a loss of from sixty to seventy million dollars a year to American growers. In addition, options on about 180 million pounds of American tobacco, now held for British account in this country, may be allowed to lapse, thereby further depressing the American market. A recent editorial in the Chicago *Tribune** puts the case in a vivid light:

> Britain wants to use her limited purchasing power in this country in the manner which will go farthest to promote victory in the war. From their viewpoint, the decision was natural and logical. When our Government, at Mr. Roosevelt's insistence, repealed the embargo on the sale of implements of war to belligerents, it became altogether certain that England would make every effort to reduce her purchases of agricultural products here, and would spend her American funds instead for airplanes, cannon, shells, trucks, and other industrial products. There are many countries besides ours from which meat, fruits, canned milk, wheat, foodstuffs, tobacco, etc., can be obtained—but no other country which can so well serve as an arsenal. . . .
>
> The consequence of the embargo repeal was obvious to anyone who would spend five minutes examining the question. [Note: A special session of Congress spent over two months in doing so!] We would aid the national defense, as the President said, and give employment to thousands of persons in the arms industries stimulated by war orders from abroad and home. We aid it, of course, at the expense of our farmers. This was manifest. But congressmen from agricultural states, whose constituents were certain to be among the first victims, voted for the President's bill. The representatives of the state of Washington in the House voted to a man for the bill, though the apple-growers were to fall an early victim to the belligerents' policy. Both of Kentucky's senators voted for the repeal, and so did seven out of nine representatives. Of the North Carolinians, only Senator Reynolds voted against the bill. His colleague, Senator Bailey, was for it; and so were all eleven members of the House from this state. Of the Vir-

*January 20, 1940.

ginians, both senators were for the bill (Mr. Glass did not vote), and so were eight of the nine representatives. If the farmers of the tobacco-growing states don't like what has happened, they know where to ask questions.

Hindsight is better than foresight, of course; but both, as well as wisdom and the courage of principled action, are requisite, if we are to avoid war in this sort of a world. Where the leaders are blind, the people perish, and peace is betrayed in the house of her friends.

II.

What is to be said, now, of the visible moral, and probable political, consequences of the partial repeal by Congress of the Neutrality Act of 1937? What of the probable military consequences, in a war that nobody wants save, perhaps, the master minds of Anglo-French capitalist imperialism, called democracy, and the unprincipled manipulators of socialistic militarism, called Fascism or Naziism, whose peoples have no other gods, apparently, than those of raging Nationalism and its bloody cults?

Having withdrawn our embargo upon the sale and exportation to Great Britain and France of the most dangerous and absolute contraband of war ("arms, ammunition, and implements of war"), and returned to the principle of *laissez-faire* in these commodities, in dealing with the greatest of recognized belligerent governments, how can we in logic or in law protest if Soviet Russia or Italy—likewise, presumably, in the name of "neutrality" or "non-intervention"—should decide actively to supply the German Government with all of the materials, machinery, and weapons of war which their controlled economic systems are capable of yielding, for a price—or at least a political consideration? How can we cut off the arch aggressor—Japan—from access to our vital supplies of petroleum, scrap iron, arms, and airplanes, with aid of which the Japanese army's outrageous aggressions upon helpless China are largely carried out, save by still another open reversal of our recently espoused internationally irresponsible commercial policy? Such a reversal—in effect a revival of the Neutrality Act's embargoes—Japan would now certainly regard, and be entitled to regard, as a deliberately warlike act, having no other sanction in international law than reprisal for alleged injuries. This need not and would not have been the case had the President chosen to acknowledge the fact of war in the Orient, two years ago, and had he then enforced the terms of the new Neutrality Act and its bi-lateral, anti-war embargoes, without fear or favor, as the spirit of the legislation certainly required him to do. Not having done so then, the Administration now confronts much graver and more difficult decisions.

One error of policy breeds another. Having recently proclaimed that international law justifies a neutral in selling arms and all the other munitions of war to belligerents in control of the seaways, who have the cash to pay for them "on the barrel-head" and take them away in their own ships, having declared that as a neutral we have no responsibility for the consequences of such sales, even though our manufacturers thereby become accessory to the conduct of war by others, can we, in the space of a few months, convince even ourselves, to say nothing of others, that international law likewise authorizes us to cut off a belligerent in the Pacific from doing what we have authorized two greater belligerents to do simultaneously in the Atlantic, without incurring any responsibility for the consequences? Both the authorization of, and an embargo against, the sale of arms to warring governments cannot be neutral, or compatible with the duty of neutrality, at the same time! To do these things in the name of neutrality and of international law, as Senator Pittman and others are now urging us to do, is to convict the United States publicly of hypocrisy and double-dealing of the most reprehensible kind, if it is not to deliver a stunning insult to such international law as does, indeed, still exist.

Such is but one of the moral and legal dilemmas into which the ethically unneutral action of the special session of the 76th Congress threatens to plunge the American people under their present opportunist leadership, in foreign policy.

The alteration of rules of neutrality by a neutral, in time of war, is in itself a grave violation of the canons of international law. More than this, it marks the inauguration of a policy, divorced from law and principle, that moves towards the abandonment of all pretense of neutrality and towards the desperate gamble of war, for ends that are obscure, with Allies whose aims are substantially undeclared. The plain lesson of American experience in dealing with the broils and strategems of the European war system indicates that the arming of one group of powers engaged in a duel with another serves, and will serve again, not to hasten the termination upon just terms of an intolerable war, but rather to prolong its agony and permit the fulfillment of the more brutal, unjust, and imperialist aims of one group of great powers at the expense of the well-being of half of Europe and of the future peace of the whole world. Is there any sound reason to anticipate any other or less terrible result, if the generals and admirals are allowed to dictate the terms of settlement after this war? Whether they be British and French generals and war-minded politicians, or German and Russian, will make little difference to humanity in the long run. The only substantial hope for a peace of moderation and renunciation, if not of reconciliation, will lie in the admitted defeat of the generals, the admirals, and the war gamblers—i. e., of the war method—all around. In short, in a peace dictated by the neutrals and the non-belligerent nations, in the interest of peaceful, law-observing states and peoples. Is that too much to hope for? . . . Verily, whosoever would succeed in keeping or in *making peace* in this desperate world must have clean hands and a neutral heart!

(*To be concluded in the next issue*)

Far from the World

Far from the world of men and things I dwell—
Where sun and moon and wind and wave hold sway,
Where Nature sings its wildest, sweetest lay
In golden silence, echoing like a bell—
Alone, but never lonely; I could tell
Of joys, new-born, companioning each day,
For Spring is here! Summer is on the way!
And I am fair bewitched! Yet I know well
Their reign will pass, their glory soon depart—
Autumn may glow, but flowers droop and die—
And winter comes. . . . Hence it is now my art
To capture happiness while flying high,
To breathe so deep of beauty, fleeting by,
That I may hold the fragrance in my heart.

ANNERIKA FRIES.

An Interview with Five American Immortals

LOUIS I. NEWMAN

The Interviewer: Gentlemen, we are gathered here tonight in order to evoke memories of the past. The times are out of joint, and we are sorely in need of counsel and guidance. In order that we may find the wisdom which the present hour demands, we are turning back the pages of American history. We are seeking to commune with the immortal leaders of our nation. Roger Williams, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln—would that you were living at this hour! America has need of you.

The Voice of Roger Williams: We are living! We are here!

Interviewer: What voice is speaking?

Voice: I am the spirit of Roger Williams, upon whom you have called.

Voice: And I am Benjamin Franklin.

Voice: And I am George Washington.

Voice: And I, Thomas Jefferson.

Voice: And I, Abraham Lincoln.

Interviewer: You are not joking with me?

Williams: We are not jesting. Whenever Americans need to be reminded of the days gone by, we can be summoned to their side.

Interviewer: There is a great deal I should like to ask you on behalf of my countrymen.

Franklin: State your questions, and we shall answer them to the best of our strength.

Interviewer: Mr. Franklin, people are saying that you declared at the Constitutional Convention against allowing persons of the Jewish faith to come into the United States. Is there any truth in this statement?

Franklin: Why, sir, that is preposterous! Any such document is a rank forgery. I always held the Hebrew race in the greatest respect. If I remember correctly, I was a contributor to the building of their synagogue in Philadelphia. I think they called it: "Mikweh Israel," the "Hope of Israel."

Interviewer: I am glad to hear you say this, Mr. Franklin. One of our historians, Mr. Charles Beard, has published an answer to the enemies of the Jewish community, and we are glad to have a confirmation of his article from your own lips.

Franklin: And you may further add that I remember the Fourth of July in the year 1787, I think it was, when a wonderful procession of citizens three hours long, celebrated the day. I watched it from the window of my house, and I saw all classes and trades in cheerful accord. I saw, on that day for the first time in the history of Philadelphia, "the clergy of almost all the different Christian denominations, with the Rabbi of the Jews, walking arm in arm." It was a most pleasing sight.

Jefferson: Permit me to express my sentiments of appreciation for the glorious idea of religious tolerance.

Interviewer: Mr. Jefferson, we will be most happy to have you add your judgments.

Jefferson: Tell your countrymen of today that we hope they have not forgotten our effort to teach them that all men are created free and equal, and that there must never be a religious test for public office.

Williams: I agree most heartily, Mr. Jefferson. It has warmed my heart to know that the ideals we sought to establish in the Providence Plantations have become the foundation stone of America.

Jefferson: Mr. Williams, we are indebted to you and your "livelie experiment" in civil and religious liberty, for the models which we in later years of the Republic have wished to imitate.

Williams: I conceive of the State as a great ship which goes to sea with many hundred souls on board, whose weal and woe is common, and is a true picture of a commonwealth or a human combination of society. It hath fallen out sometimes, that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked on one ship; upon which proposal I affirm that all the liberty of conscience that ever I pleaded for, turns upon these hinges—that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews, or Turks be forced to come to the ship's prayer or worship, nor compelled from their own particular prayer or worship, if they practise any. I further add that I never denied that, notwithstanding this liberty, the commander of this ship ought to command the ship's course, yea, also commanding that justice, peace, and sobriety be kept and practised, both among all the seamen and all the passengers.

Jefferson: This is a great and worthy conception, Mr. Williams. You know, gentlemen, that my enemies accused me of being a freethinker and an infidel. But I had the right to consider the founder of the majority religion as a human teacher. I ascribed to him every *human* excellence; and believed he never claimed any other. If my critics did not like this viewpoint, this should not prejudice posterity against me.

Washington: You need not fear, Mr. Jefferson, that history has dealt harshly with you because of your independent views.

Jefferson: Mr. Washington, I am honored to have you assure me of this.

Washington: I can only wish, in retrospect, that our coworkers in creating our country's constitution had only listened to your advice that we oppose the slavery of the black man. How right you were when you prophesied that the day would not be distant when the public mind must bear and adopt the proposition that the negro bondsmen must be set free.

Abraham Lincoln: Mr. Washington, Mr. Jefferson: had these principles been built into the fabric of our national life, I might have lived and died a country lawyer in Illinois. Yet gladly would I have renounced my claim to the applause of my countrymen, had Virginia been persuaded by the words spoken by her son, wise beyond his time, and by his fellow prophets in this great cause.

Interviewer: Pardon me if I intrude myself at this point. Yet we are most eager to learn from you if you have any comments upon the effort of certain individuals and groups to raise up strife between races and religions in our country.

Mr. Washington: Sir, you doubtless refer to the agitation against citizens of the ancient Hebrew faith. I can only reiterate my words to the Congregation at Newport, when I expressed the hope, as I recall it, that "the children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while every one shall sit in

safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid."

Lincoln: Your words have a Biblical flavor, Mr. Washington. I share with you in admiration for the Bible of Israel. I still believe that the "judgments of the Lord are just and righteous altogether."

Interviewer: Mr. Lincoln, it is still said that, like Mr. Jefferson, you were not interested in formal religion.

Lincoln: Let people say what they wish, Sir. I still assert that I will join the church which makes as its only requirement for membership an acceptance of the doctrine: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul and with all thy might, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Williams: I honor you, Mr. Lincoln, for your candor. I might ask for myself an appreciation of the role of Baptism, but I founded the Rhode Island Commonwealth in the hope that every man might worship God in the light of his own conscience. You will find at the close of the Portsmouth Code of Laws a paraphrase of the great words of Micah: "Let each man walk in the name of his God, but we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever."

Jefferson: These ideas are in entire agreement with my own.

Interviewer: Mr. Jefferson, there is great curiosity among us today, as to the reasons why you would not accept a third term as President. Can you say something which might guide us in our situation today?

Jefferson: Look here, young man, this is a matter locked up in my private conscience. I shall not impose my opinions of yesterday upon the world of today.

Lincoln: I think that unless we take our departure quickly, this brash young questioner will be asking me if I still espouse the right of people to overthrow a hated government, if necessary by armed rebellion.

Interviewer: Why, Sir, that is exactly what I was going to ask you next. How did you know?

Lincoln: I have had enough experience with reporters, including Horace Greeley, to know that they stop at nothing.

Washington: And I am of the opinion that unless we return to the celestial habitat whence we came, we will surely be involved in entangling alliances.

Interviewer: But Mr. Washington, Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Jefferson—honored forefathers—there is so much I should like to ask you in the name of my countrymen.

Franklin: Young man, when I was writing Poor Richard's Almanack, I remember some of my best sentences: "Be not thou disturbed, O grave and sober reader, if among the many serious sentences in my book, thou findest me trifling now and then, and talking idly. In all the dishes I have hitherto cooked for thee, there is solid meat enough for thy money. There are scraps from the table of wisdom that will, if well digested, yield strong nourishment to thy mind. But squeamish stomachs cannot eat without pickles; which, 'til true, are good for nothing else, but they provoke an appetite." What we have said tonight to you is pickles. Am I right, gentlemen?

The Other Immortals: You are right, Mr. Franklin, just pickles.

Interviewer: Then am I to understand that the interview is closed, and that when the pickles have whetted my appetite for more, you are leaving us?

Jefferson: Exactly, sir, and if you wish Mr. Franklin's "strong nourishment of the mind," our advice is: read history. It is full of good precedents.

Washington: In the name of my colleagues with me, I bid you good night. If you ever arrange another seance, and I can persuade Mr. Williams, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Jefferson, and Mr. Lincoln to join me again, please send us a special message.

Interviewer: But that is what I wanted, a special message. And now they are gone. . . . (Turns to the audience.) Well, gentlemen, I have done the very best I can; I hope each one is a wiser man. Poor Richard has written: "None preaches better than the ant, and she says nothing." Therefore I will say no more, and declare this interview ended.

A Naturalistic View of Religion

GARDNER WILLIAMS

The growing secularization of life raises the question of whether religion is an essential element in human society. Many men live honorable lives without any church affiliation. These seemingly irreligious folk are not perfect, of course. Nobody is. But their average is as good as that of the conventionally devout. Furthermore only a small minority of the spiritual and intellectual leaders of the community are now officials in ecclesiastical groups. The chief justification of religion has always been that it helps men to be more coöperative socially and to live better lives. But if the people can be just as good without it, and if lay social leadership is adequate, why bother to keep it?

Orthodox folk occasionally refer to the more liberal religious movements of our time as "mere" ethical culture, as if salvation did not consist in living a good life. These men mistake the symbol for the thing symbolized,—the shadow for the substance. They want people to be saved, but apparently only through their own particular theological machinery. Their attitude is understandable, but, taking a larger view of things, it is irrational. There are many roads to salvation, and it does not matter which one an individual takes so long as he arrives at the goal. The only warrant for any theology and for any church is its service to human virtue and happiness. It should be eliminated if any substitute could be found which would serve this end better. If an ethical culture philosophy can inspire society with a moral idealism greater than that which could be aroused by one of the ancient traditional religions, the ethical philosophy is better, from the points of view of the individuals in society, than the traditional religion. And these individual points of view are the ultimate authorities in all human valuations.

A decisive argument for keeping some of our supernaturalism, at least temporarily, is found in the fact that many do need it at present. The majority of mankind probably cannot now be just as good without it as they can with it. There is sometimes

a genuine value in falsehood which should give pause to those contemporary philosophers who interpret practical worth as the criterion or even as the very nature of truth. But those who can be good in spite of the fact that their philosophy is true, do not have any abnormal heredity. They were simply trained effectively in home and school and in other groups to live ordinarily virtuous lives without ecclesiastical ministrations. If the rest were to be similarly educated, might we not look forward to the time when religion could be dropped from the list of major human interests and of major social institutions?

Many would like to drop it because the dogmas and creeds are all false. It does not take a very extensive study of anthropology, history, biology, and astronomy for one to learn that traditional religious beliefs are fictions if understood to mean literally what they say. Christianity is just as mythological as Greek religion. And there is a growing naturalistic philosophy, of which some are only vaguely aware, which recognizes that the ultimate substance of the universe, that is, the supreme being or reality, is non-teleological, and is not a person, and is not God. This philosophy holds that all living things are natural growths in a natural universe whose basic substance does not possess life and mind as intrinsic qualities. Spiritual things are emergent properties in a world which is at bottom physical. Spirit is rooted in matter, though in no proper sense reducible to it. Life and mind merely depend upon it for their existence. The physical is ontologically basic, while its value, or axiological status, is secondary, derivative, peripheral, precarious, and ephemeral. The spiritual, on the other hand, is axiologically basic, while its existence is secondary, derivative, *et cetera.*

If this naturalistic philosophy is true, as it seems to me to be, the ascription of human traits to ultimate cosmic forces appears to be just another example of wish thinking. If time enough is allowed, men can in many cases convince themselves that they have proof of what they want to believe, when really there is no adequate evidence.

Is not religion then a plain violation of all standards of truth and honesty and common sense? And should we not try to hasten the day when we can safely abolish all churches? To many intelligent people it seems that we should.

But there is more to it than this. The great things in life are not so simple. While it is conceivable that a time might come when specialized religious institutions would cease to exist, still it is clear to me that no time will ever come when human society will not need religion. Individuals will have to be truly religious in order that they may live good lives and in order that the social order may endure and progress.

In other words there is a socially, morally, and spiritually essential element in religion which is separable from all theologies and from all ecclesiastical organizations. It can exist along with a naturalistic philosophy and with a life that is, by ordinary standards, completely secularized. This element is the love of God.

But what do we mean by God?

The Gods are human ideals. This is what they have been in all past ages, and it is what they still are. Minerva was the Roman Goddess or ideal of wisdom. Hermes symbolized to the Greeks the ideals of successful commerce and travel. Osiris, the Egyptian God of the Nile, stood for the ideal of economic security which was aided by the annual floods. Jaweh or Jehovah was a God of battles expressing militaristic ideals in the early days when the Hebrews were a fighting people. He was transformed into a God of love when, in the midst of their later humiliations, they came to idealize that gentler passion.

The dwelling place of the Gods is the imagination of man. Imagination is one of the two or three most important things in life, and the Gods are the most important beings located in it. They must be sharply distinguished from the supreme being, whose designation should not be capitalized. The supreme being is just the ultimate reality of the universe. It is probably physical in nature; that is it is non-teleological. It is probably something like structured force or energy. To worship it is idolatry. But everything that is conventionally said about man's utter dependence upon it is true. We are absolutely dependent upon it from moment to moment for our existence. It is the ultimate cause of all our joy and of all our sorrow. We may properly be grateful to it for the joy if we are so inclined. Such gratitude should be called *piety.* But we should not expect physical reality to understand or appreciate any thanks which we may render it. Our expressions of piety are legitimate at times in the sense that they satisfy us, not it.

The Gods are ideal and perfect, and can be loved wholeheartedly without idolatry. Morality and the social order depend upon this love. Unless men care deeply about the ultimate ends and ideals served by their activities, they will not do their work well, and they will not discipline their whims nor succeed in living integrated lives. The indispensable labor of life will be drudgery, and they are likely to be sullen, despondent, emotionally unstable, and inefficient.

They will live truly godless lives, and they will be incapable of doing properly the great and exacting work which is necessary for the support and progress of the social order. This work can be done adequately only by men who are inspired with a boundless enthusiasm for the ultimate ideals which the social order subserves. These latter persons make up the truly religious portion of the community. They worship the living Gods of the dynamic and integrated society in which their role is cast. These Gods are real whether they are personified or not. The lawyer who is devoted to the highest ideals of his profession is living a religious life. Similarly the doctor. Traditional religions have given man organized sets of ideals for the profession of being human in specific culture patterns. And they have done this very well. But they have resorted to supernaturalism and mythology in order to put their messages over with minds which have lacked scientific training. This was justified under the circumstances. But the time has come when a lot of people are ready to slough off their supernaturalism. Men today are often offended at organized religion because of its cultural lag.

The supernaturalistic element in traditional religious thinking consists chiefly in the false iden-

tification of the supreme ideal and the supreme being. The supposed resultant of this synthesis is called God. The great idealistic philosophies of Plato and Hegel and others also identify the ideal and the ultimate substance. To do this is a common form of wish thinking. Both of these factors in the popular God-concept are of course quite real. But they are very different from each other. In the interest of truth the generally accepted notion of God should be analyzed into its elements, each of which should have its own distinct designation.

The word God should be applied to the ideal factor rather than to the substantial one. For the ideal is, morally and spiritually, by far the more significant of the two. It is "what ought to be." It is the experience of obligations and standards. It is a thing which has been sanctified by social need and by social approval through the long ages of man's cultural development. And the word God is a holy word no matter how it is used. Continual and willful profanation by a large and disreputable section of the community fails to destroy its sacred character in our folkways of language. Furthermore "God" is in fact traditionally used to mean the ideal. Atheism is generally interpreted as involving a denial of moral standards. As I have indicated, "God" is also used in popular thought to mean that the ideal is identified with ultimate substance. We should simply drop out this latter fiction and use the term in its best meaning. Thus we are not inventing any new element in our proposed religious terminology. We are just getting rid of what is false in the old; and we are keeping the important part of what the word has always meant in the more advanced culture patterns.

There should be no objection to the maintenance of special institutions to cultivate the love of God unless these are thoroughly perverted and unable to perform their proper function. At present they are only partly perverted; and some of their perversions are needed to avert greater evils. Their divagations from truth may be largely justified by the fact that many people still need fictions in order to be happy and virtuous. But the churches might do more than they do to get people out of their supernaturalistic thought habits. Leadership in this work has until recently been almost exclusively in lay hands. A more serious defect in our ecclesiastical organizations is that they are now less effective in inspiring people with noble ideals than are homes, schools, books, and newspapers. These lay institutions might conceivably take over the whole work of developing ideals in people. They will have to if supernaturalism becomes thoroughly discredited and if the churches do not adapt themselves to the newer intellectual atmosphere. I believe, however, that, in spite of the weird history of organized religion, and in spite of its deep entanglement in myth and superstition, it can learn to do its work rationally and adequately. Religious mores can be changed slowly to fit a developing society, even when the development is toward better education and a more discriminating intelligence.

But let us offer the new naturalism only to those who genuinely feel the need of it. Let us not rush things too fast in religion, when politics and economics are so backward. Human society is now becoming more intelligent in some ways, but not in all ways. National and class hatreds threaten to plunge us back into another Dark Ages in which we may need all our old supernaturalisms and perhaps a few more besides. Once again, or perhaps many times, in the years to come, rational principles of correct living may have to be clothed in sensational and mythical symbols in order to win the allegiance of minds dulled and narrowed by the hard conditions of life occurring after the collapse of a great civilization.

The Scientific Spirit and the Modern World: An Indictment and a Homily*

GEORGE R. FARNUM

We are living in a period which challenges reflection and invites criticism. A paralyzing sense of frustration and anxiety has invaded the spirit of the people. In their restless and debauched imagination the future is full of uncertainty and peopled with the ominous spectres of failure and poverty, and haunted by a premonition of impending calamity. Civilization is rapidly losing all its priceless legacy of that heroism and grandeur that Emerson identified with acts of self-reliance. Life seems permeated with what William James characterized as an irremediable sense of precariousness. The tragic prophecy is beginning to be fulfilled of that "distress of nations, with perplexity . . . [and] men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth."

The prevailing scientific spirit has reduced to virtual insignificance the position of man in a universe in which he was formerly the dramatically dominant factor. It has devitalized his religion and largely destroyed those inner resources in which he once found sure refuge and certain strength. In its failure to furnish him with any adequate substitute, it has left him in an intellectual muddle, lacking confidence in the present and without faith in the future. It has been largely responsible for what Raymond Klibansky describes as "the increasing predominance of the dividing forces of Understanding over the unifying forces of Faith" which he asserts has "brought about a loosening of the strict hierarchy of all provinces of thought, valuation, and life which characterizes the intellectual world of the Middle Ages." Allied to the scientific spirit are the twins materialism and determinism characterized by Sir Arthur Eddington as "those household gods of nineteenth century science" which have strengthened their grip on life in these harassing days of war and economic collapse and have aggravated man's spiritual poverty. The picture of modern life, in fact, recalls Galsworthy's dark metaphor in which "like gnats about

*An article written for the *Journal of the Law Society of Massachusetts.*—*Editor.*

a stagnant pool on a summer evening man danced up and down without the faintest notion why."

The contemporary scene is a tragic spectacle to contemplate. But two decades after the close of the catastrophic struggle to end war, the Old World has taken another plunge into the black abyss—a plunge which may prove an irreparable disaster to Western civilization. It happens at a time when, according to a great English scholar, Graham Wallas, "civilization [was] still reeling from the effects of a war in which the whole organization of natural science was devoted to the destruction of human life and health and welfare."

Man has rubbed the Aladdin's lamp of science, and behold, the marvels that have materialized and the stupendous transformation in the physical resources of life that have come forth! Nature has yielded up the terrible secrets of her hidden powers, and her tremendous forces have submitted to the wizardry of man. With her magic formulas he has evolved instrumentalities whose ingenuity and capacity stagger the imagination of even their inventors. With his scientific genius man has revolutionized the outer aspects of existence. A dupe of his own accomplishments, however, he has been led to believe that the value of a civilization is largely reflected in the ingenuity of its machines and in the extent of the developments of the material accessories of life.

But somehow the dream of human betterment that inspired the epic work has become a nightmare from whose haunting presence man has been unable to escape. He who aspired to universal dominion over nature has become the slave of those forces that he so complacently conjured up. What were designed as submissive agents have become ruthless masters. All too late man has discovered that it is the inexorable law that the possession of power was only intended for those with a commensurate sense of social and moral responsibility. He is now paying the cruel penalty for his tragic ignorance of this categorical imperative. His boasted machines have been perverted in the hands of the morally immature to the work of frightful destruction.

He has performed wonders in the art of mechanics, worked marvels in the field of physics and wrought miracles in the domain of chemistry. The magic power he has thereby acquired has been used to inflict torture, destroy life, and spread desolation over the earth. He has invented submarine navigation which has added to the horrors of war on the sea. He has conquered the air and constructed planes from which to hurl down deadly explosives and lethal gases, not only upon combatants but upon unprotected communities and their helpless inhabitants. He has converted the automobile into an armored engine of destruction.

Animating much of the spirit of the scientific world is the attitude of a caste that largely lacks the saving grace of humility, that is sustained and inspired by a pride that is sick unto death. One is reminded of Capek's dramatic satire "R. U. R." in which the scientist who is asked, "But do you mean to say that you can improve on the works of the Creator?" disdainfully replied, "The Creator was not an engineer."

Man seems at last, however, to be arousing himself from his moral lethargy and seeking to extricate himself from his fool's paradise. Appalled at the consequences of his own colossal folly, he is beginning to ask himself in dismay the damning question, as recently framed by Harold Nicholson: "How comes it that our knowledge should so far have outstripped our wisdom that we have perfected the weapons of annihilation without acquiring the intelligence to keep those weapons under restraint?" He is pointing an accusing finger at those false prophets of science by whom he has been betrayed and among whom never a powerful or effective voice has been raised for an international strike against the prostitution of great talents to such sinful ends. He is indicting those who have never seen the necessity of teaching in our scientific institutions the higher morality which should go hand in hand with the terrible secrets that unlock the tremendous forces of nature.

What will the end be if life continues to be controlled by an undisciplined, unchastened, and unmoral scientific spirit? "It is not too soon for us in our new world of mechanical civilization," as Graham Wallas admonishes us, "to take up once more the old search for wisdom."

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention. *Editor.*]

XIII

The Reverend B. C. Hopson, an English clergyman of Hadley Wood, writes as follows:

> What do you want the church to do, I might be asked. I reply that the Pope and the Cardinals, the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England and of the other churches of the world, together with the leaders of the free churches, should issue a solemn call to all peoples to join them in a vast demonstration of protest against the foul sin and crime and insanity and stupidity of continuing the war, and to show themselves as ready to sacrifice their lives to prove their sincerity.
>
> Why should not the greatest procession ever organized in the history of the world walk unarmed between the Maginot and Siegfried Lines and risk everything to bear witness to the vileness of war?

The *Christian Pacifist,* of London, publishes the following from France:

> A charming letter, expressive of magnificent courage, has just come in from Henriette Vernier, wife of Phillipe Vernier. She, with her two small children, is helping to maintain the work of the parish (near Mons) while her husband is in prison as a conscientious objector. Phillipe seems to have been separated from his brother . . . and deprived of his books, even his Bible, and to have been kept in solitary confinement for three weeks for giving a verse from the Gospels to a comrade. But wife and husband exchange letters regularly, and, says she, "We are in quite good spirit. And Phillipe is right when he says, 'Above all, be peaceful and smiling,' which is not difficult for me because of my deep happiness; and I would never change my life."

Nofrontier News Service reports the following proclamation addressed to Mrs. Roosevelt by the women of Sweden:

A demonstration meeting, held at Stockholm under the auspices of leading Swedish women's organizations representing 520,000 women with various ideals and political views, adopted a resolution urging women in all countries to reflect upon the consequences of the total war in all its inhumanity:

"Finland has now been overtaken by this immense calamity. Finland's peaceful towns and villages, even in remote districts, are daily being subjected to air raids. Women and children, the sick and the aged, are being killed or wounded, hospitals and homes are being destroyed or rendered unhabitable, peaceful people are being forced to seek protection in cellars and woods for hours and days in the severe cold. Homeless mothers and children are being driven from one place of refuge to another.

"We support the appeal of the Swedish Red Cross to the conscience of the world to put an end to these cruelties. . . .

"We also protest against the inhuman warfare at sea, through which vessels belonging also to peaceful states are being sunk and their seamen killed.

"These excessive physical and psychical sufferings must force the women of all countries into common endeavors to find expedients by which to check the terrible happenings of the present day.

"Confronted by the existing grave situation the women of Sweden are prepared to make every personal and material sacrifice should our independence and our freedom be endangered. *But we are still convinced that only reconciliation between the peoples, and an international order of justice, can form a basis for true human culture and enduring peace.* We therefore call upon women and women's organizations throughout the world immediately to rally the women in their several countries in unanimous condemnation of the abominable total war wherever it appears and now primarily in Finland.

"Let us set to work and strain every nerve to stop the process of devastation and prevent the impending catastrophe that threatens humankind."

In the February 19th issue of UNITY, an item was published in this column (page 193) telling of the conscientious objector's attitude of Desmond Tester, an English actor who played the part of a Highland drummer boy in the motion picture, "Drums." Mr. Tester, who was granted exemption from military duties, has now published in the Glasgow *Herald,* an article defining and explaining his opposition to war. We are indebted to the *Nofrontier News Service* for the following extracts from this article:

I am no judge to say violence is wrong for everyone, though I see no argument for it. . . . But I believe that to fight is to run away. It is running away from fear. There is the fear of Hitler, of invasion, and of all the horrors we are told that would bring. For instance in the film, "A Britisher's Home," in which I appeared, one sees "foreign soldiers" descending by parachute, forcibly occupying the English house in the middle of a birthday party, using the furniture for barricades, and, finally, shooting the fine old Englishman.

This fear is a reality, but it is not in itself an evil. The evil is the flight from it and the desire to annihilate it by force, by war. . . . We know from history that war does not rid the world of fear. War breeds war and greater fear. . . . But those who disagree with me only suggest that my liver is all sorts of peculiar colors. . . .

Many people are annoyed with me for playing the part of a soldier drummer boy in "Drums," and then not doing the same job in life. But if all the actors who play murderers and criminals behaved in the same way off the screen as on, where would we all be? "Drums" was an exciting adventure story, and, as an actor, I enjoyed working on it, but I must say that when I saw the complete film I was a bit horrified by the blood and thunder so excellently photographed in "glorious technicolor." I hope others were too.

In fact, I believe propaganda of this sort is a two-edged sword. Even so I would not take parts in propaganda films now, not that I shall get any offers, as under present conditions they are as much instruments of war as Winston Churchill's speeches.

Others who write to me accuse pacifists of cowardice. It is very difficult to prove we are not, because in their eyes bravery is usually measured by feats of violent strength. They say we are cowards for not resisting evil with armed force, but surely it is harder and braver to follow the way of Jesus. . . . This proves to me that evil is a force that has to be understood as much as good. . . . We believe that good is a stronger force than evil, but I do not like the sort of good that is at one end of a seesaw and is trying to get evil off the other. To succeed, the good has to lower itself nearer to the level of its enemy. In the same way our government has assumed almost dictatorial powers in order to fight a dictator.

Perhaps the idea of finding peace for oneself sounds selfish, but one can hardly do it without influencing others a little unless, of course, one is a hermit. And, anyway, a peaceful world can only be attained by the efforts at self-realization of the individuals composing it.

So much for my reasons. They have been difficult to express, as they are the result of being alive only twenty years. I may be going in the wrong direction, but at least it is a peaceful path I am taking and not a warpath.

The Rome (Italy) correspondent of the New York *Times* finds an omen in this episode:

While the Pope spoke of Spring and the springtime of life during his regular Wednesday morning public audience, a dove flew along the ceiling and alighted on the baldachin just over the Pontiff's chair. For the 4,000 persons it was taken as a sign of grace.

The bird doubtless entered through one of the windows of the hall when it was opened for the morning's airing. Then the windows were shut and it could not get away.

On Sunday, April 21st last, the Disciples churches of this country dedicated their services to a public ceremony of enrollment of all members in their churches who wished to be placed on record as conscientious objectors to participation in war. In the *Christian Evangelist* of April 4th was published a dedication service for this occasion, which was used by many of the churches. The climax of this service came with the congregation standing and solemnly affirming "in this war period, our respect for the rights of Christian conscience and our pledge of assistance to any who may face persecution or privation because of their pacifist convictions."

The number of conscientious objectors enrolled in this nationwide ceremony of the Disciples church has not been reported at this writing. Due announcement will be made in this column.

The New York *Times* publishes the following special wireless dispatch from Oslo, Norway, dated before the German invasion:

Sigrid Undset, Norwegian novelist, proposed at a students' meeting today that the world's physicians enter the fight against war.

"The doctors of the world," she said, "are continuously working for truth and science, being just the opposite of the world's statesmen who operate with lies, murdering grownups and children."

Mrs. Undset proposed that physicians warn statesmen to stop their "inhuman activities" or the physicians would stop work.

The March 11th issue of *Life* published pictures and accompanying text showing how England is handling the problem of conscientious objectors. An encouraging and intelligent display of the wise policy of the English government!

The Study Table

A Practical Philosophy

THE HUMAN ENTERPRISE. *By M. C. Otto.* 385 *pp. New York: F. S. Crofts & Company.* $2.25.

In *The Human Enterprise* Professor Otto's usual clarity and definiteness are committed to the task of meeting the needs of "people who want philosophy to throw light on life as they know it." The effort is markedly successful. Here is pragmatism at its practical best. Bias is not only admitted but proclaimed in behalf of the interests of the human enterprise, and of human uniqueness—"the most precious thing that has emerged from the wrestling of the centuries." But even this bias cannot swerve the author from loyalty to "rigorous standards of evidence and truth."

The chapters range from "A Meditation," poetically telling why the common man finds the major interests of philosophers so far removed from his centers of attention, through twelve chapters dealing with a vast range of ideas having to do with truth, ideals, reality, science, man, God, and other related matters.

In addition to the two chapters dealing with "Science and Man," this reviewer's attention was especially attracted to the chapter on "The Two Atheisms" and the one on "The Existence of God." One kind of atheism is cosmic, the other ethical. Cosmic atheism "may be primarily a denial that 'there is a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will' . . . or disbelief in a divine purpose at work behind or within the whole of things." Ethical atheism "may be an assertion that nothing in the experienced world is of value; that intelligence, human affection, character, good will, social idealism are amiable delusions. . . . It may be disbelief in greatness of purpose in man's life; disbelief in truth, love, justice, beauty. . . ."

The distinction is important. Cosmic theism is no guaranty against ethical atheism, nor does its denial militate against the finest ethical committal to the highest value of human experience.

Perhaps the freshest and more militant chapter is that on "The Existence of God." Having not previously in the book raised the question of God's existence, Professor Otto now forthrightly declares that "the question whether a God who realizes his purposes on the scale of the universe and in the best interests of mankind exists, is distinctly relevant." Then, after sketching the origin and development of the God idea, Professor Otto, with a frankness and honesty not always found among religious heretics, asserts unequivocably that he has "arrived at an affirmative faith in the non-existence of God." He believes that the affirmation is important, that "one may be without a belief in the existence of God or have a belief in the non-existence of God." He is firmly of the conviction that belief in the non-existence is important, because, since "by tradition God has been the foundation of truth, goodness, beauty, humane feeling," etc., the sure crumbling of theistic faith endangers the foundations of these virtues. We need a positive faith in the human basis of the values of the human enterprise. Efforts to redefine God in terms of "a cosmic objectification of the best known impulses" or as "a purely abstract formula needed to make a logical demonstration click throughout," and other like attempts, are vigorously rejected. "The authority of theism is . . . not that of expanding human life." If men and women "turn to themselves and each other in good faith and with intelligence, they will be surprised by the idealistic fecundity of the human mind and heart, and by the ideal possibilities of the natural environment upon which they may draw to enrich and elevate their lives."

The human enterprise is a virile plea for a full and rich human life.

CURTIS W. REESE.

Hebraism and Hellenism

TWO CREATIVE TRADITIONS IN ENGLISH POETRY. *Edited by Seymour M. Pitcher, Joseph E. Baker, and Wilbur L. Schramm. With an introduction by Norman Foerster.* 420 *pp. New York: Farrar and Rinehart.* $2.00.

In 1869 Matthew Arnold published his famous essay on "Hebraism and Hellenism." For seventy years this phrase and its meaning have been seeping into the mind of western civilization. Now it is generally realized that two traditions, the religious and the humanistic, underlie not merely our literature but our whole civilization. Norman Foerster, who sponsors this volume, has trenchantly pointed out in his introduction the creative power of these two traditions. The editors have selected thirty-six poems to represent the Hellenistic tradition, and a similar number to represent the "Biblical and Medieval themes" which correspond to Arnold's Hebraism. To these they have added six selections to show "the Renaissance fusion," holding, quite correctly, that our present-day civilization can be understood only as the child of the two great traditions. This is an excellent book which should lead the reader back to the sources themselves. It can be used to advantage to supplement courses in English and in Biblical literature. Norman Foerster, under whose inspiration the book was written, has done much to make American civilization conscious of its heritage in Hebraism and Hellenism. Foerster is ably carrying on the tradition of Irving Babbitt, and his influence is steadily growing.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

To Our Mothers

To you, who gave us life and love
And care, when we were young,
Moulded our souls, led our first steps
The mundane maze among—
To you, on this, your festal day,
A song of praise be sung.

Last of a relay-chain that runs
From Time's horizon dim,
You passed the race-torch on to us,
So strong and lithe of limb—
Then as spectators went and stood
Beside the seat of Him—

Of Him, the ever-watchful Judge
For whom the race is run,
Near whom the tired runners meet
When their relays are done,
By whom awards are given when
The distant goal is won.

JEROME ALEXANDER.

Correspondence

Mrs. Roosevelt and the Ministers

Editor of UNITY:

I was astonished to find under the head "On the Pacifist Front," in your issue of February 19, a clipping from the New York *Herald* about a speech by Mrs. Roosevelt, addressed to the Conference of Jews and Christians. It seems to me that belongs under the heading "War Propaganda, Look Out!"

Let us grant, at once, that the President and the members of Congress are where they are by our "democratic process" of election by the people, who think or have jobs. The President is supposed to represent the Executive branch of our government and the others our lawmaking branch. How our ancestors would wring their hands of dust and the Fathers of our democracy groan in spirit if they should get even an echo that it is suggested that "some great issue" should rob us, the people, of our freedom of conscience, giving it into the keeping of a combination in Washington who have proved that they lack both conscience and common sense about this horrible war game. The majority in Congress, in response to the President, has voted millions for defense, airplanes being specially stressed. At the same time they do nothing to stop the selling to Russia of ever-increasing quantities of the special gasoline needed to propel airplanes. Surely our thousands of airplanes are not being rushed to completion to roost in hangars. In self-defense we should keep that gasoline at home. For the same reason we should keep our scrap iron and cotton goods from going to Japan. Our chemists are certainly smart enough to make from that scrap iron some kind of vitamin that will give strong backbones to rubber stamps and change political termites into worthy citizens. No need to break diplomatic relations with anyone—that would be just childish gestures, fooling no one but ourselves—as long as we are in reality in partnership with both Russia and Japan in their murder, robbery, devastation, and destruction. Self-defense has been stretched so thin, to cover so much, it is nothing to tuck in scrap iron and gasoline.

The wife of our President, with a following larger than that of the President, graciously suggests that the ministers, as voices of the Church, should be granted their freedom of conscience in opposing war, supposing they cared to do so, as so many did not choose to do in the last war. Who are ministers, rabbis, and priests? Mostly men, who got degrees from some sort of theological school, who have been installed, given the charge, or just took charge. Many of them of the past and present I honor, revere, and admire, but I will not grant even to the best among them a right to freedom of conscience above my own or that of my neighbors.

I know some other citizens who have the sweetest, finest degree ever granted. We went to the higher school but nine months, after years in the preparatory school. Our final test was hard and painful. It lasted hours, sometimes days before the degree of "Mother" was conferred. When the little one was brought for his first meal, a great thrill lifted us up and made us realize we were an important part of the great constructive force in this universe. If anyone has a right to freedom of conscience in all affairs of life and government, it is the mother of a wanted child. Even if the child is not wanted and the mother does not realize that she is a part of the constructive force, nature has ordained she shall so be.

Mothers of America, we dare not wait until November to demand that the cornerstone of our freedom be left in our keeping. We can talk *now*, we can write *now*, and if the die is not already cast we will have our congressmen home on a vacation while our neutrality is real. Every woman's club worthy of being a club should register its conscientious convictions about war.

Remember the last war. Remember the propaganda. Duty, patriotism, saviors of democracy, courage, and religious duty in some places were used to cover the ghastly "sum of all villainies." Never before has freedom of conscience, our most precious birthright, been so disgraced. Will we work on the side of construction as we were charged to do; or will we fall in line with the forces of destruction, and in so doing sell down the river our children and our children's children for generations, if not forever?

OLIVE COLE SMITH.

Coral Gables, Florida.

The Southern Traveling Seminar

Editor of UNITY:

I am writing you from the South, where I am spending some time in laying the foundations for our 1940 seminar. Some of you were with me on our first trip in 1936. Those were the days when fierce terror reigned on the plantations, so that we had to guard every move. Since then strong liberal forces, native to the South, have emerged. Witness the Second Conference for Human Welfare being held in Chattanooga these very days, at which a thousand delegates are facing bravely and thoughtfully problems of youth, industry, rural life, civil liberty, and citizenship in a democracy.

But 1940 finds the victory far from won. Ku Kluxers ride again. Bigots fan the flames of anti-Semitism. Mob lynching may, due to national publicity, be subsiding, but a new technique of quietly taking the victims out to their death is growing. Income for millions still stays at a starvation level. Opposition to effective unionization is bitter and intense. Antiquated poll-tax laws, framed originally to defeat real democracy, still deprive thousands of people of the right to vote. There is neither political nor economic democracy.

Our many friends in the South welcome our seminar each year. They realize that we come as earnest students of social conditions, ready to see all sides of their problems and willing to lend a hand. We go with humility, knowing well we have plenty of unsolved problems right in our own backyard.

I am writing to invite the coöperation of your readers in our 1940 Seminar. Write me at my permanent address, 106 Carmel Street, New Haven, Connecticut.

WILLARD UPHAUS, *Secretary.*
National Religion and Labor Foundation.

Amity, Arkansas.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 66)

cure the active coöperation and assistance of the Department of Justice in an effort to bring to light such activities as heretofore described.

From *A Report, sponsored by Senators Robert F. Wagner and Arthur Capper, and Representatives Joseph A. Cavagan and Hamilton Fish.*

Western Poets Congress

"Free India!" demanded the fifth annual Western Poets Congress on American Peace Day, April 6, in Los Angeles. Six hundred poets from throughout the West saw peace posters, heard peace poems recited by their authors or delivered by verse-speaking choirs, collaborated in declaring peace.

Delegates from poetry and literary clubs and classes, periodicals, labor unions, teachers' organizations, National Negro Congress, progressive bodies interested in culture, and other groups condemned "ways and methods" of "the notorious Dies Committee," J. Edgar Hoover's newly established "Intelligence Division" as "an American Gestapo," and poll taxes. They championed the Make Europe Pay War Debts movement, the Workers' Alliance, "American Standard" Work and Assistance Act, a far-reaching legislative program on behalf of working farmers, the LaFollette-Bulwinkle Bill for a campaign for the control of venereal disease, and backed other social legislation.

They opposed any increase to war appropriations, but called for enlarged appropriations for farm, youth, housing, education and other social projects. They called for the dismissal of all proceedings pending against Marcus Graham, advocated an "independent, united Ireland," paid a tribute to Bertrand Russell and gave "one minute of unanimous laughter at quaint, antiquated New York boasting of presenting the World of Tomorrow while bound by the superstitions of Yesteryear." Previous sessions had opposed loans to belligerents, deviations from the Bill of Rights, mobilization of civilians.

"Poets May Be Nuts but NOT in the War Machine" was the slogan one banner bore. Lucia Trent as incoming president and Ralph Cheyney as outgoing appeared at one session in sackcloth and ashes with the sign, "Public Penance (Sackcloth and Ashes) for Poets' Lies Glorifying War." Fresh impetus was given the Poets' Challenge for Peace and Freedom, which petition has been signed by several famous poets, and many less illustrious but not less sincere, and of which you are urged to send for a free copy to Ralph Cheyney, Dreamers' House, 923 East Mountain St., Pasadena, California, headquarters of Western Poets Congress.